

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION

STATE OF OHIO, ex rel OHIO ATTORNEY  
GENERAL DAVE YOST,

Plaintiff,

v.

Civil Action 2:22-cv-2700  
Judge Algenon L. Marbley  
Magistrate Judge Kimberly A. Jolson

AARON MICHAEL JONES, et al.,

Defendants.

**ORDER**

In October 2024, Plaintiff filed a Motion to Compel Discovery Responses from two Defendants—Julie Kathryn Bridge and Roy Melvin Cox, Jr. (Doc. 112). In the months since, Defendants Bridge and Cox, both of whom are now proceeding *pro se*, have worked with Plaintiff on the discovery at issue in the motion. (*See, e.g.*, Docs. 130, 145, 146, 148, 150, 153, 154). Plaintiff is satisfied with the discovery Defendant Bridge provided. (Doc. 153 (asserting that the outstanding discovery disputes with Defendant Bridge have been resolved)). The same is not true for Defendant Cox. (Doc. 154 (both sides asserting they have reached an impasse as to most of the discovery sought in the motion to compel)).

Given these developments, it seems that much of the pending motion to compel is either resolved or outdated. Therefore, the Court **DENIES without prejudice** Plaintiff's pending motion to compel (Doc. 112). Plaintiff is **ORDERED** to file an updated Motion to Compel **by April 4, 2025**. Defendant Cox's response is due **fourteen (14) days after the updated motion is filed**. Any reply is due **seven (7) days thereafter**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: March 24, 2025

/s/ Kimberly A. Jolson  
KIMBERLY A. JOLSON  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE